



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,799	03/18/2004	Anca Faur-Ghenciu	GMC 0026 PA/42320.30/GP-3	5621
7590 09/28/2005			EXAMINER	
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP One dayton Centre One South Main Street, Suite 500 Dayton, OH 45402-2023			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1754	

DATE-MAILED: 09/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/803,799

Applicant(s)

FAUR-GHENCIU ET AL.

Examiner

Wayne Langel

Art Unit

1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3, 4 and 16-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 5-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6-18-04 and 7-5-05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 1754

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-14, drawn to the water gas-shift reaction, classified in class 423, subclass 656.
- II. Claims 16-25, drawn to a catalyst, classified in class 502, subclass 304
- III. Claims 26-44, drawn to the water gas-shift reaction, classified in class 423, subclass 656.

Claim 15 link(s) inventions I and II. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claim 15. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different

Art Unit: 1754

product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, such as one which does not include the detailed limitations of the catalyst as recited in claims 16-25.

Inventions II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, such as one in which the catalyst support consists essentially of a mixed metal oxide of cerium oxide-copper oxide or zirconium oxide-copper oxide, as opposed to the support recited in claims 15-25.

Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, i.e., the mode of operation which would result from the catalyst support as recited in claims 1-14, versus the mode of operation which would result from the catalyst support as recited in claims 26-44.

Art Unit: 1754

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Beyer on September 22, 2005 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of I, claims 1-14. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 16-44 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- I. a copper compound as the anti-methanation agent.
- II. a manganese compound as the anti-methanation agent.
- III. an iron compound as the anti-methanation agent.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 5-15 and 18-25 are generic.

Art Unit: 1754

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Beyer on September 22, 2005, Mr. Beyer elected species I (a copper compound) with traverse.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1754

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hagemeyer et al '327. Hagemeyer et al '327 discloses a method for carrying out the WGS reaction in the presence of a catalyst which may include a noble metal and copper oxide supported on ceria. (See the Abstract.) Accordingly one of ordinary skill in the art could at once envisage the catalyst as recited in claims 1, 5, 7 and 15. In any event, it would be obvious to select copper oxide as a component and ceria as the carrier for the catalyst of Hagemeyer et al '327, since these members are disclosed as suitable for the catalyst.

Claims 2, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagemeyer et al '327. It would be obvious to determine suitable or optimum amounts of the various components in the catalyst of Hagemeyer et al '327.

Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hagemeyer et al '986.

Art Unit: 1754

Hagemeyer et al '986 discloses the WGS reaction in which the catalyst used comprises platinum and iron or manganese on ceria as a support. (See the Abstract.) Accordingly one of ordinary skill in the art could at once envisage the catalyst as recited in claims 1, 5, 7 and 15. In any event, it would be obvious to employ the catalyst recited in these claims, since Hagemeyer et al '986 discloses that these members will function as catalytic components and as a support, respectively.

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagemeyer et al '986. Hagemeyer et al '986 is relied upon as discussed hereinbefore. It would be obvious to determine suitable or optimum amounts of the components in the catalyst of Hagemeyer et al '986.

Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Korotkikh et al. Korotkikh et al disclose a catalyst for the WGS reaction comprising combinations of Pt with oxides of Fe or Mn on a ceria support. (See col. 7, lines 6-60.) Accordingly one of ordinary skill in the art could at once envisage the catalyst recited in claims 1, 5, 7 and 15. In any event, it would be obvious to emplot the specific combination of componentsa as recited in applicants' claims, since Korotkikh et al suggest at col..7, lines 6-60 that such combination of components would function as the catalyst.

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korotkikh et al. Korotkikh et al is relied upon as discussed hereinbefore. It would be obvious to determine suitable or optimum amounts of the components for the catalyst of Korotkikh et al.

Art Unit: 1754

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The recitation of "selected from..." is improper Markush terminology.

The other references are made of record for disclosing various WGS catalysts.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Langel whose telephone number is 571-272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Fridays from 8 to 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman, can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/803,799

Art Unit: 1754

Page 9

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Wayne A. Langel". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "W" and "L".

Wayne Langel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1754